

OSFC

Statistical Report

1 April 2016 to 30 June 2016



Contents

Chapter	Page
Purpose of Statistical Report and How to Use It	3
District and Regional comparisons:	
Falls	5
Lisburn	8
Knockbreda & Downpatrick	11
Antrim	14
Armagh	17
foyle	20
Appendix 1:	
Quality of decisions	23
Issues handled correctly	24
CCG Substitutions	25
CL Substitutions	26
CCG – Breakdown of Issues	27-33
CL – Breakdown of Issues	34-40
Appendix 2 - Time to process:	
CCG & BL – Time to process	41
Appendix 3 – OSFC Contacts	42

Purpose of Statistical Report and How to Use It

Why are the reports produced?

This Report is intended to help Social Fund Managers identify trends and issues in their District. The information in the report can therefore be used to help improve decision making and customer service. The report contains information relating to performance based on data collected by the Office of the Social Fund Commissioner (“OSFC”) through our casework.

Who produces the reports?

The report is prepared by the OSFC. If you would like to raise an issue, or if you want more information please contact OSFC on 0808 127 0417 or by e-mail at sfc@osfci.org.uk.

How often are reports issued?

A Statistical Report is produced every 3 months. This report covers the period 1 April 2016 to 30 June 2016.

How to interpret the information about the quality of decision making

An Inspector’s review has one of three outcomes, to:

- **confirm** the Reviewing Officer’s decision. The confirmation rate is the percentage of decisions where the outcome remained the same;
- **substitute** a new decision with a different outcome; or
- **refer back** the matter to the Reviewing Officer.

The Inspector also records whether the Reviewing Officer handled the decision correctly in law. This is irrespective of the outcome, so that a:

- confirmed decision could have been handled wrongly in law
- correctly made decision could be substituted (e.g. on new information)

The “correct rate” is the percentage of decisions in which all the crucial issues are handled correctly. A low “correct rate” therefore suggests a need for technical training.

It is also important to examine the relationship between “confirmations” and “correct rates”. If the confirmation rate is lower than the correct rate this indicates new information frequently came out at the Inspector stage. Could this information have been obtained earlier?

Alternatively, if the confirmation rate is higher than the correct rate, training may be required.

How to focus training in the right areas

This Report provides a further breakdown of the decisions so that it is possible to focus training and development in the right areas.

- Firstly, by showing the reasons for substituting a community care grant or crisis loan. It is possible for there to be more than one reason. This includes the total percentage of cases where important new information was obtained – regardless of whether the decision was correct.
- Secondly, by detailing why Inspectors concluded Reviewing Officer’s decisions were not handled correctly.

The top section of the breakdown of issues table shows the number of decisions where the Inspector concluded that the Reviewing Officer’s decision was incorrect (i.e. Direction 1 error). If there was an error, the reason could have been a rationality error, a natural justice error, a law error, or a combination of the above. If the error was a law error, further details are provided. The table therefore shows the frequency of an error, which can be compared to the frequency across the region.

How to use the tables on time to process

The time to process tables provide information on performance against:

- Reviewing Officer process time – 10 days (CCGs & BLs). This is the time from receipt of the request for review, to the date of the Reviewing Officer's decision; and
- Cases received within 4 days. This is the time from when an applicant asked for an independent review and papers were requested from the SSA, to the day the case papers arrived at the OSFC.

Comments on Statistical Report

OSFC welcomes comments from District Managers on any aspect of the statistical information provided, including suggestions as to how you feel this Statistical Report may be improved. Your comments should be sent to the office manager at sfc@dndni.gsi.gov.uk

Falls District

Community Care Grants

Quality – confirmation and error rates

	Region	Falls
% decisions confirmed	58.8%	56.0%
% decisions handled correctly	55.3%	52.0%

The OSFC confirms a below average percentage of decisions from Falls. The percentage of decisions with all issues handled correctly is above the regional average.

Reasons for community care grant substitutions

Inspectors substituted 36.0% of community care grant decisions. This is below the regional average of 37.3%.

	Region	Falls
Incorrect	68.9%	72.2%

An above average percentage of grant decisions are substituted due to the Reviewing Officer's decision being incorrectly made.

	Region	Falls
New Information	31.1%	27.8%

This is the total percentage of cases where important new information was obtained – regardless of whether the decision was correct.

	Region	Falls
SFI invoked Direction 49	1.9%	5.6%

The Inspector was the first person to consider a grant in an above average number of crisis loan cases.

Breakdown of issues

The issues with the most common law errors are shown below. In brackets is this number expressed as a percentage of the total number of cases which had this as a key issue:

Most common law errors Issue	Region	Most common law errors Issue	Falls
Direction 4 - Qualification	47 (21.6%)	Direction 4 - Qualification	10 (26.3%)
Inquisitorial role	33 (91.7%)	Inquisitorial role	4 (80.0%)
Priority	18 (34.0%)	Natural justice	2 (100%)

The most common crucial issues are:

- Inquisitorial role – in other words the Reviewing Officer failed to ask crucial questions where more information was needed.
- Priority – for example the priority decision reached was not a reasonable one on the available evidence or irrelevant factors were taken into account or relevant factors not addressed.
- Qualification – for example the law was misinterpreted, the wrong test was applied, or the decision reached was not a reasonable one on the available evidence.
- Natural justice - the applicant has not been given a fair opportunity to state his case or to know the case against him.

Time to process

	Region	Falls
% reviews cleared (10 working days)	86.7%	77.8%

The percentage cleared within 10 working days is below the Regional average.

Crisis Loans

Quality – confirmation and error rates

	Region	Falls
% decisions confirmed	80.4%	84.4%
% decisions handled correctly	84.0%	87.5%

The OSFC confirms an above average percentage of decisions from Falls. The percentage of decisions with all issues handled correctly is above the regional average.

Reasons for crisis loan substitutions

Inspectors substituted 15.6% of crisis loan decisions. This is below the regional average of 17.2%.

	Region	Falls
Incorrect	57.6%	80.0%

An above average percentage of decisions are substituted due to the Reviewing Officer's decision being incorrectly made.

	Region	Falls
New information	39.4%	20.0%

This is the total percentage of cases where important new information was obtained – regardless of whether the decision was correct.

	Region	Falls
SFI used Direction 49	3.0%	20.0%

The Inspector was the first person to consider a crisis loan in an above average percentage of grant cases.

Breakdown of issues

The issues with the most common law errors are shown below. In brackets is this number expressed as a percentage of the total number of cases which had this as a key issue:

Most common law errors Issue	Region	Most common law errors Issue	Falls
Direction 3 - Qualification	12 (7.2%)	Direction 3 - Qualification	2 (6.7%)
Natural justice	8 (80.0%)	No offer of interview	1 (100%)
Inquisitorial role	5 (100%)	Inquisitorial role	1 (100%)

The most common crucial issues are:

- Qualification – for example the law was misinterpreted, the wrong test was applied, or the decision reached was not a reasonable one on the available evidence
- Inquisitorial role – in other words the Reviewing Officer failed to ask crucial questions where more information was needed
- Natural justice - the applicant has not been given a fair opportunity to state his case or to know the case against him.

Lisburn District

Community Care Grants

Quality – confirmation and error rates

	Region	Lisburn
% decisions confirmed	58.8%	42.4%
% decisions handled correctly	55.3%	39.4%

The OSFC confirms a below average percentage of decisions from Lisburn. The percentage of decisions with all issues handled correctly is below the regional average.

Reasons for community care grant substitutions

Inspectors substituted 54.5% of community care grant decisions. This is above the regional average of 37.3%.

	Region	Lisburn
Incorrect	68.9%	77.8%

An above average percentage of grant decisions are substituted due to the Reviewing Officer's decision being incorrectly made.

	Region	Lisburn
New Information	31.1%	22.2%

This is the total percentage of cases where important new information was obtained – regardless of whether the decision was correct.

	Region	Lisburn
SFI invoked Direction 49	1.9%	0.0%

The Inspector was the first person to consider a grant in a below average number of crisis loan cases.

Breakdown of issues

The issues with the most common law errors are shown below. In brackets is this number expressed as a percentage of the total number of cases which had this as a key issue:

Most common law errors Issue	Region	Most common law errors Issue	Lisburn
Direction 4 - Qualification	47 (21.6%)	Direction 4 - Qualification	11 (44.0%)
Inquisitorial role	33 (91.7%)	Inquisitorial role	9 (100%)
Priority	18 (34.0%)	Natural justice	2 (100%)

The most common crucial issues are:

- Inquisitorial role – in other words the Reviewing Officer failed to ask crucial questions where more information was needed.
- Priority – for example the priority decision reached was not a reasonable one on the available evidence or irrelevant factors were taken into account or relevant factors not addressed.
- Qualification – for example the law was misinterpreted, the wrong test was applied, or the decision reached was not a reasonable one on the available evidence.
- Natural justice - the applicant has not been given a fair opportunity to state his case or to know the case against him.

Time to process

	Region	Lisburn
% reviews cleared (10 working days)	86.7%	94.1%

The percentage cleared within 10 working days is above the Regional average.

Crisis Loans

Quality – confirmation and error rates

	Region	Lisburn
% decisions confirmed	80.4%	60.7%
% decisions handled correctly	84.0%	78.6%

The OSFC confirms a below average percentage of decisions from Lisburn. The percentage of decisions with all issues handled correctly is below the regional average.

Reasons for crisis loan substitutions

Inspectors substituted 35.7% of crisis loan decisions. This is above the regional average of 17.2%.

	Region	Lisburn
Incorrect	57.6%	60.0%

An above average percentage of decisions are substituted due to the Reviewing Officer's decision being incorrectly made.

	Region	Lisburn
New information	39.4%	40.0%

This is the total percentage of cases where important new information was obtained – regardless of whether the decision was correct.

	Region	Lisburn
SFI used Direction 49	3.0%	0.0%

The Inspector was the first person to consider a crisis loan in a below average percentage of grant cases.

Breakdown of issues

The issues with the most common law errors are shown below. In brackets is this number expressed as a percentage of the total number of cases which had this as a key issue:

Most common law errors Issue	Region	Most common law errors Issue	Lisburn
Direction 3 - Qualification	12 (7.2%)	Natural justice	3 (100%)
Natural justice	8 (80.0%)	Inquisitorial role	2 (100%)
Inquisitorial role	5 (100%)	Direction 3 – Qualification	1 (5.3%)

The most common crucial issues are:

- Inquisitorial role – in other words the Reviewing Officer failed to ask crucial questions where more information was needed.
- Qualification – for example the law was misinterpreted, the wrong test was applied, or the decision reached was not a reasonable one on the available evidence.
- Natural justice - the applicant has not been given a fair opportunity to state his case or to know the case against him.

Knockbreda & Downpatrick District

Community Care Grants

Quality – confirmation and error rates

	Region	Knockbreda & Downpatrick
% decisions confirmed	58.8%	66.7%
% decisions handled correctly	55.3%	59.3%

The OSFC confirms an above average percentage of decisions from Knockbreda & Downpatrick. The percentage of decisions with all issues handled correctly is above the regional average.

Reasons for community care grant substitutions

Inspectors substituted 33.3% of community care grant decisions. This is below the regional average of 37.3%.

	Region	Knockbreda & Downpatrick
Incorrect	68.9%	77.8%

An above average percentage of grant decisions are substituted due to the Reviewing Officer's decision being incorrectly made.

	Region	Knockbreda & Downpatrick
New Information	31.1%	22.2%

This is the total percentage of cases where important new information was obtained – regardless of whether the decision was correct.

	Region	Knockbreda & Downpatrick
SFI invoked Direction 49	1.9%	0.0%

The Inspector was the first person to consider a grant in a below average number of crisis loan cases.

Breakdown of issues

The issues with the most common law errors are shown below. In brackets is this number expressed as a percentage of the total number of cases which had this as a key issue:

Most common law errors Issue	Region	Most common law errors Issue	Knockbreda & Downpatrick
Direction 4 - Qualification	47 (21.6%)	Inquisitorial role	7 (100%)

Inquisitorial role	33 (91.7%)	Direction 4 - Qualification	7 (17.1%)
Priority	18 (34.0%)	Natural justice	4 (100%)

The most common crucial issues are:

- Inquisitorial role – in other words the Reviewing Officer failed to ask crucial questions where more information was needed.
- Priority – for example the priority decision reached was not a reasonable one on the available evidence or irrelevant factors were taken into account or relevant factors not addressed.
- Qualification – for example the law was misinterpreted, the wrong test was applied, or the decision reached was not a reasonable one on the available evidence.
- Natural justice - the applicant has not been given a fair opportunity to state his case or to know the case against him.

Time to process

	Region	Knockbreda & Downpatrick
% reviews cleared (10 working days)	86.7%	82.4%

The percentage cleared within 10 working days is below the Regional average.

Crisis Loans

Quality – confirmation and error rates

	Region	Knockbreda & Downpatrick
% decisions confirmed	80.4%	87.2%
% decisions handled correctly	84.0%	80.9%

The OSFC confirms an above average percentage of decisions from Knockbreda & Downpatrick. The percentage of decisions with all issues handled correctly is below the regional average.

Reasons for crisis loan substitutions

Inspectors substituted 10.6% of crisis loan decisions. This is below the regional average of 17.2%.

	Region	Knockbreda & Downpatrick
Incorrect	57.6%	60.0%

An above average percentage of decisions are substituted due to the Reviewing Officer's decision being incorrectly made.

	Region	Knockbreda & Downpatrick
New information	39.4%	20.0%

This is the total percentage of cases where important new information was obtained – regardless of whether the decision was correct.

	Region	Knockbreda & Downpatrick
SFI used Direction 49	3.0%	0.0%

The Inspector was the first person to consider a crisis loan in a below average percentage of grant cases.

Breakdown of issues

The issues with the most common law errors are shown below. In brackets is this number expressed as a percentage of the total number of cases which had this as a key issue:

Most common law errors Issue	Region	Most common law errors Issue	Knockbreda & Downpatrick
Direction 3 - Qualification	12 (7.2%)	Other issues	3 (100%)
Natural justice	8 (80.0%)	Direction 3 - Qualification	3 (7.9%)
Inquisitorial role	5 (100%)	Natural justice	2 (66.7%)

The most common crucial issues are:

- Inquisitorial role – in other words the Reviewing Officer failed to ask crucial questions where more information was needed.
- Qualification – for example the law was misinterpreted, the wrong test was applied, or the decision reached was not a reasonable one on the available evidence.
- Natural justice - the applicant has not been given a fair opportunity to state his case or to know the case against him.

Antrim District

Community Care Grants

Quality – confirmation and error rates

	Region	Antrim
% decisions confirmed	58.8%	62.9%
% decisions handled correctly	55.3%	62.9%

The OSFC confirms an above average percentage of decisions from Antrim. The percentage of decisions with all issues handled correctly is above the regional average.

Reasons for community care grant substitutions

Inspectors substituted 34.3% of community care grant decisions. This is below the regional average of 37.3%.

	Region	Antrim
Incorrect	68.9%	58.3%

A below average percentage of grant decisions are substituted due to the Reviewing Officer's decision being incorrectly made.

	Region	Antrim
New Information	31.1%	41.7%

This is the total percentage of cases where important new information was obtained – regardless of whether the decision was correct.

	Region	Antrim
SFI invoked Direction 49	1.9%	0.0%

The Inspector was the first person to consider a grant in a below average number of crisis loan cases.

Breakdown of issues

The issues with the most common law errors are shown below. In brackets is this number expressed as a percentage of the total number of cases which had this as a key issue:

Most common law errors Issue	Region	Most common law errors Issue	Antrim
Direction 4 - Qualification	47 (21.6%)	Natural justice	3 (75.0%)
Inquisitorial role	33 (91.7%)	Priority	3 (42.9%)
Priority	18 (34.0%)	Direction 4 - Qualification	3 (11.5%)

The most common crucial issues are:

- Inquisitorial role – in other words the Reviewing Officer failed to ask crucial questions where more information was needed.
- Priority – for example the priority decision reached was not a reasonable one on the available evidence or irrelevant factors were taken into account or relevant factors not addressed.
- Qualification – for example the law was misinterpreted, the wrong test was applied, or the decision reached was not a reasonable one on the available evidence.
- Natural justice - the applicant has not been given a fair opportunity to state his case or to know the case against him.

Time to process

	Region	Antrim
% reviews cleared (10 working days)	86.7%	90.0%

The percentage cleared within 10 working days is above the Regional average.

Crisis Loans

Quality – confirmation and error rates

	Region	Antrim
% decisions confirmed	80.4%	80.0%
% decisions handled correctly	84.0%	96.0%

The OSFC confirms a below average percentage of decisions from Antrim. The percentage of decisions with all issues handled correctly is above the regional average.

Reasons for crisis loan substitutions

Inspectors substituted 16.7% of crisis loan decisions. This is below the regional average of 17.2%.

	Region	Antrim
Incorrect	57.6%	25.0%

A below average percentage of decisions are substituted due to the Reviewing Officer's decision being incorrectly made.

	Region	Antrim
New information	39.4%	75.0%

This is the total percentage of cases where important new information was obtained – regardless of whether the decision was correct.

	Region	Antrim
SFI used Direction 49	3.0%	0.0%

The Inspector was the first person to consider a crisis loan in a below average percentage of grant cases.

Breakdown of issues

The issues with the most common law errors are shown below. In brackets is this number expressed as a percentage of the total number of cases which had this as a key issue:

Most common law errors Issue	Region	Most common law errors Issue	Antrim
Direction 3 - Qualification	12 (7.2%)	Direction 3 - Qualification	1 (%)
Natural justice	8 (80.0%)		
Inquisitorial role	5 (100%)		

The most common crucial issues are:

- Inquisitorial role – in other words the Reviewing Officer failed to ask crucial questions where more information was needed.
- Qualification – for example the law was misinterpreted, the wrong test was applied, or the decision reached was not a reasonable one on the available evidence.
- Natural justice - the applicant has not been given a fair opportunity to state his case or to know the case against him.

Armagh District

Community Care Grants

Quality – confirmation and error rates

	Region	Armagh
% decisions confirmed	58.8%	58.9%
% decisions handled correctly	55.3%	64.3%

The OSFC confirms an above average percentage of decisions from Armagh. The percentage of decisions with all issues handled correctly is above the regional average.

Reasons for community care grant substitutions

Inspectors substituted 37.5% of community care grant decisions. This is above the regional average of 37.3%.

	Region	Armagh
Incorrect	68.9%	57.1%

A below average percentage of grant decisions are substituted due to the Reviewing Officer's decision being incorrectly made.

	Region	Armagh
New Information	31.1%	42.9%

This is the total percentage of cases where important new information was obtained – regardless of whether the decision was correct.

	Region	Armagh
SFI invoked Direction 49	1.9%	0.0%

The Inspector was the first person to consider a grant in a below average number of crisis loan cases.

Breakdown of issues

The issues with the most common law errors are shown below. In brackets is this number expressed as a percentage of the total number of cases which had this as a key issue:

Most common law errors Issue	Region	Most common law errors Issue	Armagh
Direction 4 - Qualification	47 (21.6%)	Direction 4 - Qualification	7 (14.9%)
Inquisitorial role	33 (91.7%)	Other issues	4 (100%)
Priority	18 (34.0%)	Inquisitorial role	3 (100%)

The most common crucial issues are:

- Inquisitorial role – in other words the Reviewing Officer failed to ask crucial questions where more information was needed.
- Priority – for example the priority decision reached was not a reasonable one on the available evidence or irrelevant factors were taken into account or relevant factors not addressed.
- Qualification – for example the law was misinterpreted, the wrong test was applied, or the decision reached was not a reasonable one on the available evidence.

Time to process

	Region	Armagh
% reviews cleared (10 working days)	86.7%	78.4%

The percentage cleared within 10 working days is below the Regional average.

Crisis Loans

Quality – confirmation and error rates

	Region	Armagh
% decisions confirmed	80.4%	93.1%
% decisions handled correctly	84.0%	93.1%

The OSFC confirms an above average percentage of decisions from Armagh. The percentage of decisions with all issues handled correctly is above the regional average.

Reasons for crisis loan substitutions

Inspectors substituted 6.9% of crisis loan decisions. This is below the regional average of 17.2%.

	Region	Armagh
Incorrect	57.6%	0.0%

A below average percentage of decisions are substituted due to the Reviewing Officer's decision being incorrectly made.

	Region	Armagh
New information	39.4%	100%

This is the total percentage of cases where important new information was obtained – regardless of whether the decision was correct.

	Region	Armagh
SFI used Direction 49	3.0%	0.0%

The Inspector was the first person to consider a crisis loan in a below average percentage of grant cases.

Breakdown of issues

The issues with the most common law errors are shown below. In brackets is this number expressed as a percentage of the total number of cases which had this as a key issue:

Most common law errors Issue	Region	Most common law errors Issue	Armagh
Direction 3 - Qualification	12 (7.2%)	Natural justice	1 (50.0%)
Natural justice	8 (80.0%)	Direction 3 - Qualification	1 (3.7%)
Inquisitorial role	5 (100%)		

The most common crucial issues are:

- Inquisitorial role – in other words the Reviewing Officer failed to ask crucial questions where more information was needed.
- Qualification – for example the law was misinterpreted, the wrong test was applied, or the decision reached was not a reasonable one on the available evidence.
- Natural justice - the applicant has not been given a fair opportunity to state his case or to know the case against him.

foyle District

Community Care Grants

Quality – confirmation and error rates

	Region	foyle
% decisions confirmed	58.8%	60.7%
% decisions handled correctly	55.3%	50.0%

The OSFC confirms an above average percentage of decisions from foyle. The percentage of decisions with all issues handled correctly is below the regional average.

Reasons for community care grant substitutions

Inspectors substituted 33.9% of community care grant decisions. This is below the regional average of 37.3%.

	Region	foyle
Incorrect	68.9%	68.4%

A below average percentage of grant decisions are substituted due to the Reviewing Officer's decision being incorrectly made.

	Region	foyle
New Information	31.1%	31.6%

This is the total percentage of cases where important new information was obtained – regardless of whether the decision was correct.

	Region	foyle
SFI invoked Direction 49	1.9%	5.3%

The Inspector was the first person to consider a grant in an above average number of crisis loan cases.

Breakdown of issues

The issues with the most common law errors are shown below. In brackets is this number expressed as a percentage of the total number of cases which had this as a key issue:

Most common law errors Issue	Region	Most common law errors Issue	foyle
Direction 4 - Qualification	47 (21.6%)	Direction 4 - Qualification	9 (22.0%)
Inquisitorial role	33 (91.7%)	Inquisitorial role	8 (100%)
Priority	18 (34.0%)	Priority	6 (66.7%)

The most common crucial issues are:

- Inquisitorial role – in other words the Reviewing Officer failed to ask crucial questions where more information was needed.
- Priority – for example the priority decision reached was not a reasonable one on the available evidence or irrelevant factors were taken into account or relevant factors not addressed.
- Qualification – for example the law was misinterpreted, the wrong test was applied, or the decision reached was not a reasonable one on the available evidence.

Time to process

	Region	foyle
% reviews cleared (10 working days)	86.7%	98.2%

The percentage cleared within 10 working days is above the Regional average.

Crisis Loans

Quality – confirmation and error rates

	Region	foyle
% decisions confirmed	80.4%	72.7%
% decisions handled correctly	84.0%	72.7%

The OSFC confirms a below average percentage of decisions from foyle. The percentage of decisions with all issues handled correctly is below the regional average.

Reasons for crisis loan substitutions

Inspectors substituted 21.9% of crisis loan decisions. This is above the regional average of 17.2%.

	Region	foyle
Incorrect	57.6%	71.4%

An above average percentage of decisions are substituted due to the Reviewing Officer's decision being incorrectly made.

	Region	foyle
New information	39.4%	28.6%

This is the total percentage of cases where important new information was obtained – regardless of whether the decision was correct.

	Region	foyle
SFI used Direction 49	3.0%	0.0%

The Inspector was the first person to consider a crisis loan in a below average percentage of grant cases.

Breakdown of issues

The issues with the most common law errors are shown below. In brackets is this number expressed as a percentage of the total number of cases which had this as a key issue:

Most common law errors Issue	Region	Most common law errors Issue	foyle
Direction 3 - Qualification	12 (7.2%)	Direction 3 - Qualification	4 (13.8%)
Natural justice	8 (80.0%)	Natural justice	2 (100%)
Inquisitorial role	5 (100%)	Inquisitorial role	1 (100%)

The most common crucial issues are:

- Inquisitorial role – in other words the Reviewing Officer failed to ask crucial questions where more information was needed.
- Qualification – for example the law was misinterpreted, the wrong test was applied, or the decision reached was not a reasonable one on the available evidence.
- Natural justice - the applicant has not been given a fair opportunity to state his case or to know the case against him.

Appendix 1

Quality of Decisions

DISTRICT	Total Decisions			CCG Confirmed			CL Confirmed			BL Confirmed		
	Total	Con- firmed	%	Total	Con- firmed	%	Total	Con- firmed	%	Total	Con- firmed	%
Antrim	60	42	70.0%	35	22	62.9%	25	20	80.0%	0	0	0.0%
Armagh	86	61	70.9%	56	33	58.9%	29	27	93.1%	1	1	100.0%
Falls Road	84	57	67.9%	50	28	56.0%	32	27	84.4%	2	2	100.0%
Foyle	90	58	64.4%	56	34	60.7%	33	24	72.7%	1	0	0.0%
Knockbreda & Downpatrick	101	77	76.2%	54	36	66.7%	47	41	87.2%	0	0	0.0%
Lisburn	63	33	52.4%	33	14	42.4%	28	17	60.7%	2	2	100.0%
Total	484	328	67.8%	284	167	58.8%	194	156	80.4%	6	5	83.3%

Issues Handled Correctly

District	Total Decisions			CCG Correct			CL Correct			BL Correct		
	Total	Correct	%	Total	Correct	%	Total	Correct	%	Total	Correct	%
Antrim	60	47	78.3%	35	22	62.9%	25	24	96.0%	0	0	0.0%
Armagh	86	65	75.6%	56	36	64.3%	29	27	93.1%	1	1	100.0%
Falls Road	84	57	67.9%	50	26	52.0%	32	28	87.5%	2	2	100.0%
Foyle	90	54	60.0%	56	28	50.0%	33	24	72.7%	1	0	0.0%
Knockbreda & Downpatrick	101	70	69.3%	54	32	59.3%	47	38	80.9%	0	0	0.0%
Lisburn	63	38	60.3%	33	13	39.4%	28	22	78.6%	2	2	100.0%
Total	484	331	68.4%	284	157	55.3%	194	163	84.0%	6	5	83.3%

CCG Substitutions

District	Total Substituted			Substituted Incorrect		New Information (all decisions with new information, both correct/incorrect)		SFI Invoked Dir 49 (all decisions with new information, both correct/incorrect)	
	Total	Substituted	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Antrim	35	12	34.3%	7	58.3%	5	41.7%	0	0.0%
Armagh	56	21	37.5%	12	57.1%	9	42.9%	0	0.0%
Falls Road	50	18	36.0%	13	72.2%	5	27.8%	1	5.6%
Foyle	56	19	33.9%	13	68.4%	6	31.6%	1	5.3%
Knockbreda & Downpatrick	54	18	33.3%	14	77.8%	4	22.2%	0	0.0%
Lisburn	33	18	54.5%	14	77.8%	4	22.2%	0	0.0%
Total	284	106	37.3%	73	68.9%	33	31.1%	2	1.9%

CL Substitutions

District	Total Substituted			Substituted Incorrect		New Information (all decisions with new information, both correct/incorrect)		SFI Invoked Dir 49 (all decisions with new information, both correct/incorrect)	
	Total	Substituted	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Antrim	24	4	16.7%	1	25.0%	3	75.0%	0	0.0%
Armagh	29	2	6.9%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%	0	0.0%
Falls Road	32	5	15.6%	4	80.0%	1	20.0%	1	20.0%
Foyle	32	7	21.9%	5	71.4%	2	28.6%	0	0.0%
Knockbreda & Downpatrick	47	5	10.6%	3	60.0%	1	20.0%	0	0.0%
Lisburn	28	10	35.7%	6	60.0%	4	40.0%	0	0.0%
Total	192	33	17.2%	19	57.6%	13	39.4%	1	3.0%

Community Care Grants - Breakdown of Issues

Northern Ireland

	Total					
Number of decisions	284					
Number with issues handled incorrectly	115	40.5%	Right		Wrong	
Facts or Evidence	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Unfairness or bias	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
No offer of interview	6	1.5%	0	0.0%	6	100.0%
Dir-4 Qualification	218	53.6%	171	78.4%	47	21.6%
Other Issues	10	2.5%	0	0.0%	10	100.0%
Eligibility	6	1.5%	5	83.3%	1	16.7%
Inquisitorial Role	36	8.8%	3	8.3%	33	91.7%
Direction 7	1	0.2%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Exclusions	7	1.7%	1	14.3%	6	85.7%
Priority	53	13.0%	35	66.0%	18	34.0%
Amount of Award	5	1.2%	3	60.0%	2	40.0%
Natural Justice	16	3.9%	1	6.3%	15	93.8%
Direction 49	49	12.0%	46	93.9%	3	6.1%
	407		265	65.1%	142	34.9%

** The total number of issues may be greater than the total number of decisions.

Community Care Grants - Breakdown of Issues

Falls

	Total					
Number of decisions	50					
Number with issues handled incorrectly	20	40.0%	Right		Wrong	
Facts or Evidence	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Unfairness or bias	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
No offer of interview	2	3.0%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%
Dir-4 Qualification	38	56.7%	28	73.7%	10	26.3%
Other Issues	1	1.5%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Eligibility	2	3.0%	1	50.0%	1	50.0%
Inquisitorial Role	5	7.5%	1	20.0%	4	80.0%
Direction 7	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Exclusions	3	4.5%	1	33.3%	2	66.7%
Priority	6	9.0%	5	83.3%	1	16.7%
Amount of Award	1	1.5%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Natural Justice	2	3.0%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%
Direction 49	7	10.4%	7	100.0%	0	0.0%
	67		43	64.2%	24	35.8%

** The total number of issues may be greater than the total number of decisions.

Community Care Grants - Breakdown of Issues

Lisburn

	Total					
Number of decisions	33					
Number with issues handled incorrectly	19	57.6%	Right		Wrong	
Facts or Evidence	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Unfairness or bias	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
No offer of interview	1	2.4%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Dir-4 Qualification	25	59.5%	14	56.0%	11	44.0%
Other Issues	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Eligibility	1	2.4%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%
Inquisitorial Role	9	21.4%	0	0.0%	9	100.0%
Direction 7	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Exclusions	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Priority	2	4.8%	1	50.0%	1	50.0%
Amount of Award	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Natural Justice	2	4.8%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%
Direction 49	2	4.8%	2	100.0%	0	0.0%
	42		18	42.9%	24	57.1%

** The total number of issues may be greater than the total number of decisions.

Community Care Grants - Breakdown of Issues

Knockbreda & Downpatrick

	Total					
Number of decisions	54					
Number with issues handled incorrectly	22	40.7%	Right		Wrong	
Facts or Evidence	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Unfairness or bias	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
No offer of interview	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Dir-4 Qualification	41	47.7%	34	82.9%	7	17.1%
Other Issues	3	3.5%	0	0.0%	3	100.0%
Eligibility	3	3.5%	3	100.0%	0	0.0%
Inquisitorial Role	7	8.1%	0	0.0%	7	100.0%
Direction 7	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Exclusions	1	1.2%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Priority	14	16.3%	10	71.4%	4	28.6%
Amount of Award	1	1.2%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%
Natural Justice	4	4.7%	0	0.0%	4	100.0%
Direction 49	12	14.0%	11	91.7%	1	8.3%
	86		59	68.6%	27	31.4%

** The total number of issues may be greater than the total number of decisions.

Community Care Grants - Breakdown of Issues

Antrim

	Total					
Number of decisions	35					
Number with issues handled incorrectly	12	34.3%	Right		Wrong	
Facts or Evidence	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Unfairness or bias	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
No offer of interview	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Dir-4 Qualification	26	47.3%	23	88.5%	3	11.5%
Other Issues	1	1.8%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Eligibility	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Inquisitorial Role	4	7.3%	2	50.0%	2	50.0%
Direction 7	1	1.8%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Exclusions	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Priority	7	12.7%	4	57.1%	3	42.9%
Amount of Award	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Natural Justice	4	7.3%	1	25.0%	3	75.0%
Direction 49	12	21.8%	11	91.7%	1	8.3%
	55		41	74.5%	14	25.5%

** The total number of issues may be greater than the total number of decisions.

Community Care Grants - Breakdown of Issues

Armagh

	Total					
Number of decisions	56					
Number with issues handled incorrectly	18	32.1%	Right		Wrong	
Facts or Evidence	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Unfairness or bias	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
No offer of interview	1	1.2%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Dir-4 Qualification	47	58.0%	40	85.1%	7	14.9%
Other Issues	4	4.9%	0	0.0%	4	100.0%
Eligibility	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Inquisitorial Role	3	3.7%	0	0.0%	3	100.0%
Direction 7	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Exclusions	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Priority	15	18.5%	12	80.0%	3	20.0%
Amount of Award	2	2.5%	1	50.0%	1	50.0%
Natural Justice	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Direction 49	9	11.1%	9	100.0%	0	0.0%
	81		62	76.5%	19	23.5%

** The total number of issues may be greater than the total number of decisions.

Community Care Grants - Breakdown of Issues

Foyle

	Total					
Number of decisions	56					
Number with issues handled incorrectly	25	44.6%	Right		Wrong	
Facts or Evidence	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Unfairness or bias	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
No offer of interview	2	2.6%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%
Dir-4 Qualification	41	53.9%	32	78.0%	9	22.0%
Other Issues	1	1.3%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Eligibility	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Inquisitorial Role	8	10.5%	0	0.0%	8	100.0%
Direction 7	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Exclusions	3	3.9%	0	0.0%	3	100.0%
Priority	9	11.8%	3	33.3%	6	66.7%
Amount of Award	1	1.3%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%
Natural Justice	4	5.3%	0	0.0%	4	100.0%
Direction 49	7	9.2%	6	85.7%	1	14.3%
	76		42	55.3%	34	44.7%

** The total number of issues may be greater than the total number of decisions.

Crisis Loans - Breakdown of Issues

Northern Ireland

	Total					
Number of decisions	194					
Number with issues handled incorrectly	31	16.0%	Right		Wrong	
Facts or Evidence	1	0.5%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%
Unfairness or bias	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
No offer of interview	2	1.0%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%
Dir-3 Qualification	167	83.1%	155	92.8%	12	7.2%
Other Issues	3	1.5%	0	0.0%	3	100.0%
Eligibility	8	4.0%	8	100.0%	0	0.0%
Inquisitorial Role	5	2.5%	0	0.0%	5	100.0%
Direction 7	3	1.5%	1	33.3%	2	66.7%
Exclusions	2	1.0%	1	50.0%	1	50.0%
Priority	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Amount of Award	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Direction 49	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Withdrawn	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Repayability	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
TFM	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Natural Justice	10	5.0%	2	20.0%	8	80.0%
Jurisdiction	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	201		168	83.6%	33	16.4%

** The total number of issues may be greater than the total number of decisions.

Crisis Loans - Breakdown of Issues

Falls

	Total					
Number of decisions	32					
Number with issues handled incorrectly	4	12.5%	Right		Wrong	
Facts or Evidence	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Unfairness or bias	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
No offer of interview	1	2.9%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Dir-3 Qualification	30	85.7%	28	93.3%	2	6.7%
Other Issues	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Eligibility	3	8.6%	3	100.0%	0	0.0%
Inquisitorial Role	1	2.9%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Direction 7	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Exclusions	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Priority	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Amount of Award	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Direction 49	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Withdrawn	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Repayability	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
TFM	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Natural Justice	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Jurisdiction	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	35		31	88.6%	4	11.4%

** The total number of issues may be greater than the total number of decisions.

Crisis Loans - Breakdown of Issues

Lisburn

	Total					
Number of decisions	28					
Number with issues handled incorrectly	6	21.4%	Right		Wrong	
Facts or Evidence	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Unfairness or bias	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
No offer of interview	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Dir-3 Qualification	19	70.4%	18	94.7%	1	5.3%
Other Issues	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Eligibility	2	7.4%	2	100.0%	0	0.0%
Inquisitorial Role	2	7.4%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%
Direction 7	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Exclusions	1	3.7%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%
Priority	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Amount of Award	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Direction 49	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Withdrawn	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Repayability	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
TFM	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Natural Justice	3	11.1%	0	0.0%	3	100.0%
Jurisdiction	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	27		21	77.8%	6	22.2%

** The total number of issues may be greater than the total number of decisions.

Crisis Loans - Breakdown of Issues

Knockbreda & Downpatrick

	Total					
Number of decisions	47					
Number with issues handled incorrectly	9	19.1%	Right		Wrong	
Facts or Evidence	1	2.0%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%
Unfairness or bias	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
No offer of interview	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Dir-3 Qualification	38	76.0%	35	92.1%	3	7.9%
Other Issues	3	6.0%	0	0.0%	3	100.0%
Eligibility	2	4.0%	2	100.0%	0	0.0%
Inquisitorial Role	1	2.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Direction 7	2	4.0%	1	50.0%	1	50.0%
Exclusions	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Priority	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Amount of Award	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Direction 49	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Withdrawn	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Repayability	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
TFM	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Natural Justice	3	6.0%	1	33.3%	2	66.7%
Jurisdiction	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	50		40	80.0%	10	20.0%

** The total number of issues may be greater than the total number of decisions.

Crisis Loans - Breakdown of Issues

Antrim

	Total					
Number of decisions	25					
Number with issues handled incorrectly	1	4.0%	Right		Wrong	
Facts or Evidence	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Unfairness or bias	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
No offer of interview	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Dir-3 Qualification	24	96.0%	23	95.8%	1	4.2%
Other Issues	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Eligibility	1	4.0%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%
Inquisitorial Role	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Direction 7	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Exclusions	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Priority	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Amount of Award	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Direction 49	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Withdrawn	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Repayability	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
TFM	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Natural Justice	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Jurisdiction	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	25		24	96.0%	1	4.0%

** The total number of issues may be greater than the total number of decisions.

Crisis Loans - Breakdown of Issues

Armagh

	Total					
Number of decisions	29					
Number with issues handled incorrectly	2	6.9%	Right		Wrong	
Facts or Evidence	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Unfairness or bias	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
No offer of interview	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Dir-3 Qualification	27	93.1%	26	96.3%	1	3.7%
Other Issues	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Eligibility	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Inquisitorial Role	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Direction 7	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Exclusions	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Priority	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Amount of Award	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Direction 49	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Withdrawn	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Repayability	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
TFM	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Natural Justice	2	6.9%	1	50.0%	1	50.0%
Jurisdiction	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	29		27	93.1%	2	6.9%

** The total number of issues may be greater than the total number of decisions.

Crisis Loans - Breakdown of Issues

Foyle

	Total					
Number of decisions	33					
Number with issues handled incorrectly	9	27.3%	Right		Wrong	
Facts or Evidence	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Unfairness or bias	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
No offer of interview	1	2.9%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Dir-3 Qualification	29	82.9%	25	86.2%	4	13.8%
Other Issues	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Eligibility	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Inquisitorial Role	1	2.9%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Direction 7	1	2.9%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Exclusions	1	2.9%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Priority	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Amount of Award	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Direction 49	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Withdrawn	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Repayability	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
TFM	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Natural Justice	2	5.7%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%
Jurisdiction	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	35		25	71.4%	10	28.6%

** The total number of issues may be greater than the total number of decisions.

Appendix 2 - Time to process

CCG & BL - Time to Process

District	CCG				BL				Combined CCG & BL						
	Number of Reviews	2nd Stage (request to RO review)		Avg time taken (days)	Number of Reviews	2nd Stage (request to RO review)		Avg time taken (days)	Number of Reviews	2nd Stage (request to RO review)		3rd Stage (request to papers rec'd)		Combined Time	
		Within 10 days	%			Within 10 days	%			Within 10 days	%	Within 4 days	%	Within 14 days	%
Antrim	40	36	90.0%	6.7	0	0	0.0%	0	40	36	90.0%	40	100.0%	38	95.0%
Armagh	51	40	78.4%	7.2	2	2	100.0%	4.5	53	42	79.2%	52	98.1%	49	92.5%
Falls Road	45	35	77.8%	7.2	2	2	100.0%	3.5	47	37	78.7%	38	80.9%	40	85.1%
Foyle	57	56	98.2%	7.4	1	1	100.0%	1	58	57	98.3%	58	100.0%	58	100.0%
Knockbreda & Downpatrick	51	42	82.4%	7.7	0	0	0.0%	0	51	42	82.4%	51	100.0%	45	88.2%
Lisburn	34	32	94.1%	5.6	2	2	100.0%	1	36	34	94.4%	35	97.2%	36	100.0%
Total	278	241	86.7%	6.9	7	7	100.0%	1.7	285	248	87.0%	274	96.1%	266	93.3%

Appendix 3 – OSFC contacts

Social Fund Commissioner	Mr Walter Rader OBE <u>sfc@dndni.gsi.gov.uk</u>
Statistical Reports	Nikki Croft 08081270417 <u>sfc@dndni.gsi.gov.uk</u>
Casework (for progress, information before the Inspector’s decision)	Nikki Croft 08081270417 <u>sfc@dndni.gsi.gov.uk</u>
(for queries, complaints after the Inspector’s decision)	08081270417 <u>sfc@dndni.gsi.gov.uk</u>
Leaflets and Publications	Nikki Croft 08081270417 <u>sfc@dndni.gsi.gov.uk</u>
OSFC website (contains a range of information and support including, quarterly and annual statistics reports, Corporate Plans and Annual Reports)	www.osfcni.org.uk